United Nations S/2000/933

Security Council

Distr.: General
29 September 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 28 September 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On the instructions of my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a statement by Yoweri K. Museveni, President of the Republic of Uganda to the thirty-sixth summit meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held at Lomé, on the question of the candidature of the Sudan for membership in the Security Council. President Museveni's objections clearly show that there was no consensus in the OAU summit meeting and, in the absence of such, there cannot be an endorsement.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter together with its annex issued as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Matia Mulumba **Semakula Kiwanuka**
Ambassador

00-67003 (E) 031000

Annex to the letter dated 28 September 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Statement made by His Excellency Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, President of the Republic of Uganda on the candidature of the Sudan for a seat on the Security Council, Lomé, 11 July 2000

Position of Uganda on the candidature of the Sudan for the United Nations Security Council seat

1. As indicated at the closed session of yesterday, Uganda objects to the candidature of the Sudan to represent our region in the United Nations Security Council. Below are Uganda's reasons for that objection.

2. The group of members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in New York have, over the years, evolved a procedure for the selection of African representation in various United Nations bodies. The procedure is as follows:

(a) An interested country presents its candidature to the African Group of Ambassadors;

(b) The Group of Ambassadors normally refers such an application to a smaller committee, consisting of about 10 countries. This committee is known as the Candidatures Committee;

(c) The Candidatures Committee selects a suitable African applicant for the particular post and refers the matter back to the Group of Ambassadors, which then undertakes to designate the particular candidate as the selected sole African candidate;

(d) A rule of thumb, which over the years has evolved into a respected practice, is that where there are many applicants, a rotational system is adopted. Under this system, a country that served on the particular body, in this case the Security Council, furthest back would automatically be designated. In the case of the Security Council seat, the Sudan last served in 1972-1973, Mauritius in 1974-1975, the United Republic of Tanzania in 1975-1976 and Uganda in 1981-1982;

(e) This process, however, does not end in New York. The African Group in New York seeks the formal support of the entire OAU by recommending the particular candidate of the OAU General Secretariat through the African Group in Addis Ababa, where a similar Group of Ambassadors exists. This Group has its own rule which requires that a particular candidate be presented to it three months prior to the election to the post. The Ambassadors then make recommendations to the OAU Council of Ministers through its Ministerial Committee on Candidatures. The Council then decides the matter on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.

Sequence of events with respect to the candidature of the Sudan

3. With respect to the Security Council seat, African representation in the non-permanent seat is on a rotational basis among the five regions in Africa, namely, southern Africa, eastern Africa, Central Africa, West Africa and North Africa.

4. The current seat for which the Sudan is vying is due to be filled by a candidate from eastern Africa which consists of Uganda, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Comoros, Seychelles and Mauritius. Another rule of thumb here is that this particular group is responsible for the selection from among its members of a candidate who will then be forwarded to the larger African Group for endorsement. The coordinator of the eastern African Group did not undertake this consultation. At a brief meeting of OAU Ambassadors with the Under-Secretary-General — Adviser for Special Assignments in Africa, the Ambassador of the Sudan suddenly announced his country's candidature. Uganda objected to this proposal and was supported by Nigeria and the Niger.

5. In a separate development, Mauritius, which had also been vying for the seat, informed the OAU General Secretariat through the African Group of its intention to run for the Security Council seat. Mauritius followed the OAU procedure of submitting an application three months prior to a particular election. The Sudan, on the other hand, never made any submission to OAU. It is for this reason that the Sudan does not appear on the current agenda of the OAU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures — it did not comply with the procedures laid down in Addis Ababa. Here in Lomé, the Ministerial Committee deliberated on this matter on 9 July 2000 but never completed its work and has not, to date, reported to the Council. Mauritius informed the Committee that because of this lack of consensus it intended to take this matter to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government.

6. An important point to remember is that the Sudan is still under Security Council sanctions (resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996)). It would not be wise for the OAU to propose as its representative on the Security Council a country that is still under sanctions by that same Council.

7. The matter of sanctions against the Sudan is due to be discussed sometime in November 2000 but the election of new non-permanent members to the Security Council will be held earlier, in October. The Sudan should be advised to defer its candidature in favour of Mauritius until 2001, in the hope that, by that time, the sanctions against it will have been lifted.

8. It appears that there was not sufficient consultation in the Eastern African Group. If this had been done, I am certain the group would have pointed out the weakness in the application of the Sudan and it would not have been elected to represent our region. This explains why the candidature of the Sudan was sponsored by countries outside the Eastern African Group because the Sudan knew that our regional group would not give the candidature its blessing. The so-called rotational rule only applies in a situation where there are no other reasons against a particular candidate. Otherwise, a particular candidate must have a clean record before the automatic rotational procedure can be successfully applied.

* * *

9. Apart from the reasons of procedure and United Nations sanctions, Uganda objects to the candidature of the Sudan because of the incredible criminal terrorism that the Sudan has been, either directly or by proxy, perpetrating on Uganda in the form of kidnapping of children, most of whom are used as sex slaves and infected with AIDS, burning them alive as happened at Kichwamba Technical Institute, etc. We have complained to various agencies of the United Nations, including the United

Nations Children's Fund, about all this, to no avail. Uganda is coping and will, eventually, defeat this terrorism.

10. Uganda cannot, therefore, give backing to Sudan in the light of these incredible acts even if it did not go into other moral questions that are internal to Sudan.

United Nations S/2000/934

Security Council

Distr.: General
2 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

In my capacity as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, I have the honour to request that the Security Council urgently convene a meeting to respond to the critical situation in Occupied East Jerusalem, other parts of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and parts of Israel.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Dumisani S. **Kumalo**
Ambassador
Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa
to the United Nations

00-66985 (E) 021000

United Nations S/2000/935

Security Council

Distr.: General
2 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to write to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group at the United Nations and to inform you that the Group convened an urgent meeting today to consider the recent Israeli aggression against Al-Haram Al-Sharif and the attacks by Israeli security forces against Palestinian civilians.

The Islamic Group expressed grave concern over this critical turn of events and authorized me to convey to you its request for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the deteriorating situation.

I would be grateful if you would kindly arrange for this letter to be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) **Hasmy** Agam
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations
Chairman of the Islamic Group

00-66991 (E) 021000

United Nations A/55/440-S/2000/936

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 41
Question of Palestine

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the Secretary-General

In my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I should like to draw your attention, as a matter of urgency, to the violent confrontations between the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) and police and Palestinian worshippers at Al-Aqsa Mosque and throughout the Haram al-Sharif compound that erupted on 28 September 2000. Violent confrontations also took place all across the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. According to media reports, 40 Palestinians died in the clashes. Altogether, some 1,500 people were reported injured. Reports indicate that most of the dead and injured sustained wounds caused by rubber-coated metal bullets and live ammunition. Moreover, excessive force was used by IDF against the Palestinian protesters, including tanks, helicopter gunships, anti-tank missiles and grenades.

On behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I would like to express the gravest and growing concern at the continued confrontations in the Old City of Jerusalem and throughout the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The Committee is dismayed by the loss of life as a result of these confrontations. It is particularly saddened by the tragic deaths of innocent Palestinian children.

The Committee is of the view that the events of the past several days are a direct result of the policies and practices of the Israeli occupation. To this day, Israel has continued to violate its obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (the Fourth Geneva Convention), and the provisions of dozens of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Our Committee has warned on a number of occasions that Israel's failure to live up to those principles, as well as the continued lack of progress in the Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations, would allow despair and frustration to set in, putting the peace process in considerable jeopardy and leading to increased volatility on the ground.

00-67015 (E) 031000

The Committee therefore addresses an urgent appeal to you, as well as to all the parties concerned, to take the necessary steps in order to induce Israel to abide by its obligations and responsibilities under the Fourth Geneva Convention, to guarantee its respect for the Holy Places and to ensure international protection of the Palestinian people.

In the light of the above, the Committee reiterates its long-standing position that the United Nations should continue to exercise its permanent responsibility towards all the aspects of the question of Palestine, including the issue of Jerusalem, until it is resolved in a satisfactory manner, in conformity with relevant United Nations resolutions and in accordance with international legitimacy, and until the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are fully realized.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 41, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ibra Deguène **Ka**
Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the
Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

United Nations A/55/441–S/2000/937

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 40
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 2 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I would like to update you on the tragic events that have taken place in recent days in Jerusalem and in the West Bank and Gaza.

The events in these areas represent the latest and most severe developments in a wave of violence that has been building over the past few weeks. The attacks began with the throwing of stones and Molotov cocktails in the vicinity of the Netzarim Junction on 13 September. This was followed by the killing of an Israeli soldier by a roadside bomb on 27 September, and the murder of an Israeli police officer by a Palestinian policeman in a joint patrol on 29 September.

The events of this past Friday on the Temple Mount represent a further escalation of the Palestinian violence. Muslim worshippers, out of a desire to violently confront both Israeli police and civilians on the eve of the Jewish New Year, hurled rocks and other objects at Jewish worshippers gathered at the Western Wall below. Israeli police attempted to turn back the protesters through non-violent means, but the mob persisted, attempting to force its way out of the Temple Mount area and through the Mughrabim gate to the Western Wall plaza. At this point, Israeli forces, who had been deployed outside the perimeter of the Mount, were compelled to enter the area to push back the charging mob. The stone-throwing mob continued in its violence for a period of more than four hours.

Regrettably, the wave of Palestinian violence did not stop there. During the last 24 hours alone, there have been over 30 incidents of unprovoked live gunfire directed against Israeli civilians and security forces. One Israeli civilian was shot and killed at close range when dropping his car off at a Palestinian-owned garage in the village of Maskheh. A soldier was killed, and a civilian moderately wounded, in a shooting near the town of Beit Sahour. Two Israeli policemen were wounded in gunfire from armed Palestinian security forces near Jericho and Palestinian attackers opened fire on a school bus near Shiloh.

Meanwhile, the mob violence continues unabated. Let there be no doubt, we are not faced with peaceful demonstrators. There have been numerous instances of

00-67027 (E) 031000

live fire emanating from within protesting crowds, in a fatal phenomenon encountered throughout the Palestinian Authority territories.

Let me stress that in all the cases mentioned above, Israeli security personnel returned fire only when absolutely necessary and when faced with an imminent threat to life and limb. Israeli forces exercised all possible restraint in their efforts to restore calm and security, and only took action as a last resort, in order to protect the lives of civilians, police officers and Israeli soldiers, as any government would be obligated to do.

We must stress that the responsibility for this distressing escalation lies squarely with the Palestinian Authority, not only due to its failure to take action to halt these events, but also for its incitement of the population through inflammatory rhetoric and calls to violence. Furthermore, Palestinian Authority policemen and security forces have taken an active role in the events, including the use of live ammunition against Israelis.

Most disturbing for Israel is the wholesale violation of signed agreements regarding the use of weapons by Palestinian policemen and paramilitary groups such as the Tanzim group of Arafat's own Fatah faction. The Palestinians have turned these weapons against the same Israeli soldiers with whom they were meant to carry out joint security tasks.

It is regrettable that at such a sensitive time in the Middle East peace process, the Palestinians have once again decided to resort to violence for political gain. Experience has repeatedly shown that the Palestinian Authority's willingness to incite popular violence as a means to elicit concessions in the negotiations serves only to divert the peace process from its course and to hinder our ability to arrive at a final settlement.

We call upon the Palestinian leadership to do its utmost to calm the situation and to create a climate conducive to the advancement of peace negotiations. Specifically, we call upon the Palestinian Authority to act responsibly, and to put an immediate halt to the unrestrained use of gunfire by Palestinian police, to collect the illegal weapons in the hands of the Tanzim, and to distance Palestinian protesters from Israeli positions, as is their obligation under our agreements.

I must reiterate that Israel, for its part, remains committed to achieving a peace settlement with our Palestinian neighbours, even in the face of such violence. We call upon Chairman Arafat to cease the incitement and bloodshed and to return to the negotiating table in earnest. For our part, we will continue the search for peace with the same determination that we use today to confront the violence and restore security.

In closing, I would like to express my sorrow at this tragic loss of life. It is precisely this human suffering that our peace efforts are meant to eliminate.

I would be grateful if you would have the text of this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 40, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Yehuda **Lancry**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations

United Nations S/2000/938

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to request that, in accordance with its previous practice, the Security Council invite the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations to participate in the forthcoming meeting of the Security Council to be held on Tuesday, 3 October 2000, regarding the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem.

(*Signed*) Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations

00-67242 (E) 031000

United Nations S/2000/939

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Hussein Hassouna, Ambassador, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the Council's forthcoming discussions on the situation in Palestinian occupied territories.

(*Signed*) Said Ben **Mustapha**
Ambassador

00-67248 (E) 031000

United Nations A/55/445–S/2000/940

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 64
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 25 September 2000, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter, its annex and appendix circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ümit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-67149 (E) 091000

Annex to the letter dated 3 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to convey herewith a letter dated 25 September 2000 addressed to you by H.E. Mr. Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, concerning the recent statement made by the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister, Mr. Ioannis Kasoulides, at the fifty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly (see appendix).

I should be grateful if you could have the present letter and its appendix circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Aytuğ **Plümer**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Appendix to the letter dated 30 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the Secretary-General

I wish to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister, Mr. Ioannis Kasoulides, on 21 September 2000, at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to bring the following to your kind attention.

With regard to the fraudulent claim by Mr. Kasoulides that Turkey "invaded" Cyprus, I would like to emphasize that Turkey had no choice but to intervene in Cyprus in 1974 in accordance with its rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee in order to prevent the annexation of the island by Greece and to save the Turkish Cypriot people from total annihilation at the hands of the Greek Cypriots and the invading Greek troops. It will be recalled that the then Green Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios, in his address to the Security Council on 19 July 1974, confirmed that it was indeed Greece that had invaded the island in 1974. Today, the only "occupation" in Cyprus is the 37-year-long occupation of the seat of the "Government of the Republic of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot side.

The allegations contained in the above-mentioned statement by Mr. Kasoulides that there was an "armed insurgency" and "deliberate decision of the Turkish Cypriot leadership to withdraw its representatives from ... the organs of the Government" is completely false and misleading. The record shows that it was the Greek Cypriot side, which, in order to unite Cyprus with Greece, destroyed the 1960 partnership Republic by force of arms, usurped the title of the Government of Cyprus and forcibly ejected the Turkish Cypriot partner from all organs of the state in 1963. Efforts of the Turkish Cypriot members of the House of Representatives to return to the House and take up their seats, and the refusal of the Greek Cypriot side to comply, are fully recorded in the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 29 July 1965 to the Security Council as follows:

> "The Turkish members requested UNFICYP to extend its good offices to enable them to receive information about the time of the meetings of the House, and to make arrangements for the Turkish Cypriot members to attend such meetings in safety. They specified that, if officially invited and notified about matters to be considered, as required by the Constitution, they would be prepared to attend the Parliament on all questions, not only on the two bills now pending. ... Mr. Clerides stated that unless the Turkish Cypriot members accepted the conditions [stripping them of their constitutional rights as co-partners] laid down by him, he found it pointless to supply them the copies of the pending bills. ... He made it plain that, unless agreement was reached on these matters, he would not permit the Turkish Cypriot members to attend the House. ... He subsequently stated that in his opinion the Turkish Cypriot members had no legal standing any more in the House." (S/6569, paras. 7, 9 and 11)

Mr. Kasoulides has also claimed that "ethnic cleansing" occurred in Cyprus in 1974. The truth is that ethnic cleansing did occur in Cyprus, but it was between 1963 and 1974 when the Greek Cypriots massacred hundreds of innocent Turkish Cypriots, including three-day-old babies, women and elderly people in an effort to eliminate the Turkish Cypriots or to force them out of Cyprus. Today Bosnia-and-Kosovo-like mass graves at Atlilar-Muratağa and Sandallar stand as evidence of the

crimes committed by the Greek Cypriot side against the Turkish Cypriot people. Furthermore, contrary to Mr. Kasoulides' claim, it was the Turkish Cypriot people who were violently uprooted as a result of the Greek Cypriot onslaught. The Turkish Cypriot people who were forced to evacuate 103 villages had to take refuge in relatively secure enclaves and live under inhuman conditions for 11 years until the Turkish intervention in 1974.

The allegation made by Mr. Kasoulides that the Turkish side has "advanced" in Akyar emanate from the false and unacceptable pretence that the sovereignty of the Greek Cypriot administration, which purports to be the "government of Cyprus", extends over the entire island. Akyar, as is well known, is within the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus over which the Greek Cypriot administration has no jurisdiction or any right of say whatsoever.

It is clear from Mr. Kasoulides' statement that the Greek Cypriot administration is finding it difficult to come to grips with the reality created through the destruction of the 1960 partnership Republic of Cyprus, the outcome of which has been the coming into existence of two sovereign States in the island. While inviting the Turkish Cypriot side to look to the future, the Greek Cypriot side remains hostage to its long-term aspiration of making Cyprus Greek, with a Turkish Cypriot "minority", by hanging onto its usurped title of the "government of Cyprus". It is interesting to note that before becoming the leader of the Greek Cypriot administration Mr. Clerides had admitted, in his memoirs, *Cyprus: My Deposition*, that there have been two administrations in the island since the destruction of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side in 1963.

The Greek Cypriot party's persistent negative attitude has again manifested itself at the opening of the fourth round of proximity talks. The negative reaction shown by the Greek Cypriot party to your opening statement of 12 September 2000, which, among other things, supports the principle of political equality of the two parties; refers to "a comprehensive settlement enshrining a new partnership"; and stresses that each of the two parties represents its side, and no one else, confirms that the Greek Cypriot administration rejects the equal political status and the sovereign rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, indispensable elements of any kind of reconciliation on the island. The Greek Cypriot mentality, which denies these indispensable elements, is what created the Cyprus question four decades ago and helped sustain it. Mr. Kasoulides' statement confirms that the same mentality of the Greek Cypriot administration continues to this day.

The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus looks to the future with realism. We believe that a peaceful future in Cyprus can only be achieved through a partnership between the two sovereign states in the island under a confederal roof. To this end, the Turkish Cypriot party has been participating in the ongoing process of United Nations-sponsored proximity talks in good faith since December 1999 and has put forward constructive, comprehensive and realistic proposals with a view to assisting in pushing the process forward. We hope that the international community will strongly urge the Greek Cypriot side to fundamentally change its approach to the Cyprus issue and to concede to the reality that the Greek Cypriot administration does not and is not entitled to represent the Turkish Cypriot people or the whole island and that there exist two separate and sovereign states in Cyprus, so that the chances of reconciliation in the island will improve.

I should be grateful if you could have the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Tahsin **Ertuğruloğlu**
Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence

United Nations S/2000/941

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 28 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to my letter of 3 March 2000 (S/2000/201) in which I proposed, and members of the Security Council subsequently approved (S/2000/202), the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS) until 31 March 2001.

As members of the Council will recall, in his letter to me dated 3 February 2000, President Kumba Yala requested that the mandate of UNOGBIS be extended "for at least two years" to help his Government cope with the post-electoral challenges that the new realities in Guinea-Bissau present. The President recently reiterated that request in discussions with my Representative.

Bearing in mind that events in Guinea-Bissau and the situation in the entire subregion continue to require the United Nations to play a constructive role in the consolidation of peace, I propose that the mandate of UNOGBIS be extended until the end of 2001.

This extension will enable UNOGBIS, in close cooperation with other members of the United Nations system in the field, to contribute further to the consolidation of democratic gains and help Guinea-Bissau lay the foundations for lasting peace and development.

I should be grateful if you would bring the present letter to the attention of members of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-67176 (E) 031000 031000

United Nations S/2000/942

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that, as requested, your letter dated 28 September 2000 concerning your proposal to extend the mandate of the United Nations Peace-Building Support Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNOGBIS) until the end of 2001 (S/2000/941) has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the proposal contained in your letter.

(*Signed*) Martin **Andjaba**
President of the Security Council

00-67182 (E) 031000

United Nations S/2000/943

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 28 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to my letter dated 3 December 1999 (S/1999/1235), in which I proposed, and the Security Council subsequently approved (S/1999/1236), the establishment of the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA) for an initial period of one year. The current mandate of BONUCA will expire on 14 February 2001.

Following consultations with the Government of the Central African Republic, I propose that this mandate be extended until 31 December 2001. In light of the difficult situation in the country and the climate of instability in the subregion, this extension would allow the Office to continue to support the efforts of the Government of the Central African Republic to consolidate peace and national reconciliation and to strengthen democratic institutions and the rule of law.

I should be grateful if you would bring this letter to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-67188 (E) 031000 031000

United Nations S/2000/944

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that, as requested, your letter dated 28 September 2000 concerning your proposal to extend the mandate of the United Nations Peace-Building Support Office in the Central African Republic (BONUCA) until 31 December 2001 (S/2000/943) has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the proposal contained in your letter.

(*Signed*) Martin **Andjaba**
President of the Security Council

00-67194 (E) 031000

United Nations S/2000/945

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 28 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 15 October 1999 (S/1999/1065) by which the Security Council approved the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in Liberia (UNOL) until 31 December 2000.

Following my consultations with the Government of Liberia, and bearing in mind the difficult situation in the country and the present instability in the subregion, which affects Liberia, I should like to propose that the mandate of UNOL be extended for one year, until 31 December 2001.

This extension would enable UNOL to support the Government's efforts to consolidate democracy and promote national reconciliation and the rule of law, including the protection of human rights. This would also allow UNOL to contribute to subregional efforts to normalize relations between Liberia and its neighbours.

I should be grateful if you would bring the present letter to the attention of members of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-67200 (E) 031000 031000

United Nations S/2000/946

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that, as requested, your letter dated 28 September 2000 concerning your proposal to extend the mandate of the United Nations Peace-Building Support Office in Liberia (UNOL) until 31 December 2001 (S/2000/945), has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the proposal contained in your letter.

(Signed) Martin **Andjaba**
President of the Security Council

00-67206 (E) 031000

United Nations S/2000/947

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 October 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 29 September 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to Security Council resolutions 1312 (2000) of 31 July 2000 and 1320 (2000) of 15 September 2000, which established the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) and authorized its mandate.

On the basis of the customary consultations, I intend to appoint, with immediate effect, Mr. Legwaila Joseph Legwaila (Botswana) as my Special Representative for Ethiopia and Eritrea.

I should be grateful if you would bring this matter to the attention of the Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-67212 (E) 031000 031000

United Nations S/2000/948

Security Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 3 October 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 29 September 2000 concerning the appointment of Legwaila Joseph Legwaila (Botswana) as your Special Representative for Ethiopia and Eritrea (S/2000/947) has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the intention contained therein.

(Signed) Martin **Andjaba**
President of the Security Council

00-67218 (E) 031000